



THE KDW GROUP

Suite 500
1200 19th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
tel (202) 955-9659
fax (202) 955-9792
thekdwgroup.com

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

OCT - 3 2002

ORIGINAL

October 3, 2002

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Via Hand Delivery

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
The Portals
445 - 12th Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Notice of Ex Parte Presentation by Talk America
CC Docket Nos. 01 - 338, 96-98 and 98-147

Dear Ms. Dortch:

Pursuant to Sections 1.1206(b)(1) and (2) of the Commission's Rules we hereby submit, on behalf of Talk America ("Talk"), in the above-captioned docketed proceedings, this notice of an oral ex parte presentation made on October 2, 2002 to William Maher, Chief of the Wireline Competition Bureau of the Federal Communications Commission and his staff: Michelle Carey, Chief of the Policy Division; Richard Lerner; and Scott Bergmann. The presentation was made by myself; George Vinall, Executive Vice President Business Development of Talk America; Francie McComb, VP Regulatory of Talk America; Rebecca Sommi, VP Operations of Broadview Network; Lisa Korner Butler, VP Regulatory of Broadview Networks; Jeff Oxley, General Counsel of Eschelon Communications; and Brad Mutschelknaus, Partner, Kelley Drye & Warren LLP. A set of talking points was distributed during the meeting; a copy is attached to this notice.

Pursuant to Sections 1.1206(b)(1) and (2) of the Commission's Rules, we submit an original and one (1) copy of this oral ex parte notification and attached talking points for inclusion in the public record of the above-referenced proceedings. Please direct any questions regarding this matter to the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Burnett Gold
Principal
The KDW Group LLC

Encl:

No. of Copies rec'd 0+2
List ABCDE

UNE-P to UNE-L Transition A Proposal

AccessOne
AmeriMex Communications
Broadview Networks
Eschelon Telecom
exPeTel

Genesis Communications
Midwest Telecom of America
Spectrotel
Talk America

A METHODOLOGY FOR TRANSITIONING FROM UNE-P TO UNE-L

■ Regulatory Construct

- UNE-P must always exist at certain levels
- Methodology should not preempt states that have made or will make different rules
- FCC will establish a framework for implementation by states (like TELRIC)
- States will only undertake analysis after defined preconditions are met
- Existing UNE-P base would be grandfathered
- Methodology would replace current rules

CREATING A TRANSITION PROCESS

- Preconditions
- Impairment Analysis
- Transition

PRECONDITIONS

1: Equal Access To Loop Facilities

- Electronic equal access created competition in long distance
- CLECS are impaired without electronic provisioning for local loop facilities
- Requirements for equal access MUST be met
 - For mass market local competition must have electronic provisioning
 - Electronic provisioning must be scalable
 - Must have access to OSS and line database systems for seamless and efficient conversion

PRECONDITIONS

2: Incumbent Performance

- Electronic provisioning must be subject to performance measures
 - Current “project managed” conversions are outside of performance measures plans
- Transition methodology should not be triggered by any state in which ILEC performance measure violations have been cited in last two years
 - RBOC would have received Section 271 approval

IMPAIRMENT ANALYSIS

State specific impairment analysis

- State analysis must focus on rational, economic preconditions for facilities deployment
- States must analyze cost factors that drive the economics of:
 - Switch deployment
 - Collocation
 - Transition to UNE-L (hot cuts)
 - Retail/wholesale pricing margins
 - Interoffice transport

TRANSITION PROCESS

1. FCC to establish regulatory rules for transition process for UNE-P to UNE-L
2. FCC to establish operational and technical requirements for ILECs to trigger transition
3. States, using the methodology defined by FCC, determines the following:
 1. Minimum number of lines required for switch implementation
 2. Minimum number of lines in an end office required for economic collocation
 3. Minimum number of end offices in a LATA required for economic migration to UNE-L
 1. Market Penetration
 2. IOF Requirements (i.e. availability at UNE rates and/or competitive alternatives)
4. Adequate time intervals to implement above